



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,149	03/28/2001	Katsuhisa Yuda	NEC WNZ-2310	3988

7590 05/01/2003
HAYES, SOLOWAY, HENNESSEY, GROSSMAN & HAGE, PC
175 Canal Street
Manchester, NH 03101

EXAMINER

CROWELL, ANNA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/820,149

Applicant(s)

YUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle Crowell

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 3,6,9,12,15,18, 19, 21,24,27,30,33,36,39,42,45 and 47-51.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,13,14,16,17, 20,22,23,25,26,28,29,31,32,34,35,37,38,40,41,43,44 and 46.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. The applicant recites the limitation, “wherein aperture ratio of the perforated holes to the plate is not greater than five percent”. This limitation is unclear since several aperture ratios can be established.

For example, the term “holes” includes two or more holes and therefore to yield an aperture ratio of less than five percent, the diameter of two holes would be larger than the diameter required for achieving the claimed aperture ratio with 50 or 100 holes.

Examiner suggests defining the aperture ratio in terms of the holes and the plate areas.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 13, 14, 16, 23, 25, 26, 28, 35, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuda (Japanese Patent Publication 11-168094).

Referring to Drawings 8-10 and paragraphs [0040]-[0043], Yuda discloses a remote plasma chemical vapor deposition apparatus comprising a chamber wall 16 (body), oxygen gas inlet 5 (first inlet), monosilane and inert gas inlets 9, 24 (second inlet), oxygen plasma region 6 (plasma generation region), silicon oxide precursor region 10 (processing region), RF impression electrode 1 (energy source), middle mesh plate electrode 26 (plate, closure electrode, gas supplier plenum), and a counter electrode 2 (substrate supporter).

Art Unit: 1763

Oxygen gas is supplied to the RF impression electrode and is excited to create oxygen plasma between the RF impression electrode and the middle mesh plate electrode. Monosilane gas and inert gas are supplied to the processing chamber via the middle mesh plate electrode.

The middle mesh plate electrode 26 divides the chamber 16 into a plasma generation region and processing region. The middle mesh plate electrode further includes several holes 27, 28, 30 (plurality of perforated holes). The oxygen radical holes 27 have a plurality of upper and lower holes which are connected by tube walls. The oxygen radical holes 27 allow oxygen radicals to pass through the middle mesh plate electrode. Monosilane gas and inert gas flow through the monosilane gas nozzle 27 and inert gas nozzle 28 (gas injection holes) located in the bottom of the middle mesh plate electrode. A silicon precursor gas 10 is formed when the oxygen radical gas 7 mixes with the monosilane gas 27.

Regarding Claims 11, 14, 23, and 26, the middle mesh plate electrode 26 acts as both a plate and a closure electrode. The middle mesh plate electrode 26 is electrically grounded so that oxygen radicals may flow through the openings.

Regarding Claims 35 and 38, as seen in Figure 8, the distance between the holes is smaller than the distance between the middle mesh plate electrode 26 and the counter electrode 2.

Yuda does not expressly disclose the claimed aperture ratio of not greater than five percent.

Figure 6 of Yuda is similar to Figure 7 of the instant application and both figures have the same number of holes; however, Yuda simply fails to disclose the dimensions of the perforated holes and the plate. Nevertheless, it appears that the perforated plate of Yuda is identical to the

Art Unit: 1763

claimed perforated plate of the instant application. Additionally, a prima facie case of obviousness still exists because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the aperture ratio (hole area and plate area) during routine experimentation depending upon, for example, the desired gas flow, and such limitation would not lend patentability to the instant application absent the showing of unexpected results. Finally, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device (In *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984)).

7. Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 17, 20, 22, 29, 31, 32, 34, 41, 43, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuda (Japanese Patent Publication 11-168094) in view of Sameshima et al. (U.S. 5,304,250).

The teachings of Yuda have been discussed above.

Yuda fails to teach the diameter of each hole inside the plate.

Referring to Figure 2 and column 4, lines 15-21, Sameshima teaches a remote plasma chemical vapor deposition apparatus which uses a disk shaped mesh plate 1 (plate, closure electrode) to divide the chamber into a plasma generation chamber 22 and a substrate treatment chamber 21. The disk shaped mesh plate 1 has a plurality of holes 4 and each hole has a diameter of approximately 3 mm. The hole size and number of holes allows plasma to form either a uniform film or etch a large substrate area. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the plate of Yuda with a hole

Art Unit: 1763

diameter of approximately 3 mm as taught by Sameshima. This would allow plasma to form either a uniform film or etch a large substrate area.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect the 102 rejection have been considered and found persuasive.

9. Applicant's arguments filed April 18, 2003 with respect to the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection, Yuda failing to disclose two separate inlets, and the Sameshima reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicant has argued that the 112 rejection is an error.

However, as noted above, the claim does not specifically claim an aperture ratio in terms of the holes and plate areas.

Note that the applicant states that the aperture ratio is (the area of the perforated holes times the number of holes) divided by the (cross sectional area of the plate). However, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., perforated hole **area** and plate **area**) are not recited in the claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 1763

2. Applicant has argued that Yuda fails to disclose a first inlet communicating with the plasma generation region to introduce a first gas into the plasma generation region, and a second inlet communicating with the processing region to supply a second gas into the processing region.

As seen in Drawings 1, 4, 5, and 8, Yuda satisfies this requirement by providing an oxygen gas inlet 5 into the plasma generation region and a monosilane gas inlet 9 and an inert gas inlet 24 into the processing region.

3. Applicant has argued that Sameshima fails to teach an aperture ratio and separate gas inlets.

The Sameshima reference was only used to teach the diameter size of the aperture hole.

Both Yuda and Sameshima teach having separate gas inlets.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Crowell whose telephone number is (703) 305-1956. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 - 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1763

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

AMC *AME*
April 29, 2003

Luz L. Alejandro
Luz L. Alejandro
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1763